TRANSPORTATION FUNDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 91

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 91. IT'S NO LONGER NEEDED.

As the official proponents of this measure, we are encouraging you to VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 91.

In 2006, our coalition qualified this measure for the ballot as a means of stopping the Governor and Legislature from taking the state sales tax on gasoline, which is supposed to be used on transportation projects, and using those funds for non-transportation purposes.

As this initiative was being qualified, Governor Schwarzenegger and a bipartisan group of legislators put a different constitutional measure on the November 2006 ballot that also accomplished what Proposition 91 set out to do. That measure, Proposition 1A, was approved by an overwhelming 77% of California voters in November 2006.

Passage of Prop. 1A means that state politicians in Sacramento can no longer take our gas tax

dollars and use those funds for non-transportation purposes.

Because Prop. 1A is now law, hundreds of millions of dollars in existing gasoline sales taxes are being sent each year to local communities for projects to relieve traffic congestion, improve safety, and fund mass transit.

By passing Proposition 1A, voters solved the problem of state raids of our gas tax funds.

Proposition 91 is no longer needed.

We respectfully urge you to vote NO ON PROPOSITION 91.

MARK WATTS, Executive Director Transportation California JIM EARP, Executive Director California Alliance for Jobs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 91 ★

No argument against Proposition 91 was submitted.